

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the final official action dated November 12, 2008 (hereafter, “the official action”). This paper is timely filed as it is accompanied by a petition for extension of time and authorization to charge our credit card in the amount of the requisite fee. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 29610/CDT320.

Claims 57-86 are pending, but claims 74, 76, and 78-86 have been withdrawn as directed to a non-elected embodiment.

By the foregoing, claim 57 has been amended and new claims 87 and 88 have been added. No new matter has been added. Authorization to charge our credit card in the amount of the fee for two additional claims in excess of 20 is submitted herewith.

Claims 57-73, 75, and 77 have been rejected as indefinite.

Additionally, claims 57, 58, 60, 62-73, 75, and 77 have been rejected as assertedly anticipated by or as assertedly obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0079512 to Yamazaki et al. (“Yamakazi”). Claims 59 and 61 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as assertedly obvious over Yamakazi in view of WO 99/49525 to Petritsch et al. (“Petrisch”).

The various bases for the claim rejections are addressed below in the order presented in the action. Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the following remarks.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 57-73, 75, and 77 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, as assertedly indefinite.

The applicants respectfully submit that claim 57, as presented in the last response, was not indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112. Alternative limitation such as “optionally” are permissible. *See* M.P.E.P. §2173.05 III. Nonetheless, the rejections should be removed in view of the amendments to claim 57 presented herein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)/ 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 57, 58, 60, 62-73, 75, and 77 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as assertedly anticipated by, or as assertedly obvious over Yamazaki. Claims 59 and 61 have been rejected as assertedly obvious over Yamakazi in view of Petritsch. The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 57 recites a combined information display and information input device comprising a matrix of independently addressable light emitting devices and a plurality of light sensing devices, said light emitting devices comprising organic light emitting diodes comprising organic light emitting material positioned between a low work function electrode formed from a low work function material layer and a high work function electrode formed from a high work function material layer, and said light sensing devices comprising organic photovoltaic devices comprising at least an organic electron donor and at least an organic electron acceptor positioned between a high work function electrode formed from a high work function material layer and a low work function electrode formed from a low work function material layer, wherein the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices are disposed on a common substrate and share the same high work function electrode formed from the same high work function material layer and/or the same low work function electrode from the same low work function material layer.

In contrast, the anodes of the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices are provided as separate layers in Yamakazi, and are not shared between the devices, as claimed. Similarly, the cathodes of the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices are provided as separate layers in Yamakazi, and thus are not shared between the devices, as claimed. This can be seen, for example, in Figure 4 of Yamakazi in which the anode 406 and cathode 408 of the photodiode 421 are formed in separate layers relative to the anode 409 and cathode 411 of the EL element 422. The examiner's comments regarding capacitive or electrical sharing of the layers have been addressed by the claim amendments presented herein, which clarify that at least one of the high work function electrode and the low work function electrode is shared — both structurally and functionally — in the claimed invention. Such sharing is not present or even possible in the Yamakazi device.

As described in the second full paragraph on page 1 of the present application, displays which require overlying layers for emission and sensing have the disadvantage that the introduction of further layers in addition to those of the display itself adds to the complexity of the display. Additional layers also increase the thickness of the display and thereby increase light absorption within the display. These very same problems occur in the arrangement disclosed in Yamakazi.

In contrast to Yamakazi, the claimed invention provides a combined information display and information input device which retains at least one common electrode layer in both the light emitting and light sensing devices. For example, Figures 4a to 4g of the present application, illustrate an embodiment wherein anode layer 402 and cathode layer 408 are shared by both the sensing and emitting devices (the claimed sensing and emitting devices share at least one electrode layer). It is advantageous to provide the two different sensing and emitting devices on a common substrate surface while depositing certain common electrode layers using the same material as these common electrode layers can advantageously be deposited in a single deposition step. In Yamakazi, the sensing and emitting devices are disposed on different layers and manufactured in separate and distinct processes, and there is no recognition that at least one electrode layer can be shared, as claimed. Accordingly, the claimed invention is not anticipated by, or obvious over Yamakazi.

Petritsch was merely cited for its disclosure of organic electron donors and organic electron acceptors and thus adds nothing further to the above analysis.

In view of the above, the applicants respectfully submit that the outstanding rejections as anticipated by, or obvious over Yamakazi should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form or procedure in an effort to advance this application to allowance, he is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

May 12, 2009



Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,130
Attorney for Applicants
6300 Sears Tower
233 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300